

Table S2 NEWCASTLE OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT of included studies. Taken from: PA Modesti et al., (2016) .¹⁷

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE (adapted for cross sectional studies)	Ayuk et al. 2018	Garba et al. 2014	Mpairwe et al. 2019
Selection: (Maximum 5 stars)			
1) Representativeness of the sample:			
a) Truly representative of the average in the target population. * (all subjects or random sampling)	★	★	★
b) Somewhat representative of the average in the target population. * (non-random sampling)			
c) Selected group of users.			
d) No description of the sampling strategy.			
2) Sample size:			★
a) Justified and satisfactory. *	★		★
b) Not justified.		0	
3) Non-respondents:			
a) Comparability between respondents and non-respondents' characteristics is established, and the response rate is satisfactory. *			
b) The response rate is unsatisfactory, or the comparability between respondents and non-respondents is unsatisfactory.			
c) No description of the response rate or the characteristics of the responders and the non-responders.	0	0	
4) Ascertainment of the exposure (risk factor):			
a) Validated measurement tool. **	★ ★		★ ★
b) Non-validated measurement tool, but the tool is available or described. *		★	
c) No description of the measurement tool.			
Comparability: (Maximum 2 stars)			
1) The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confounding factors are controlled.			
a) The study controls for the most important factor (select one). *	0	0	★
b) The study control for any additional factor. *	0	0	★
Outcome: (Maximum 3 stars)			
1) Assessment of the outcome:			
a) Independent blind assessment. **	★ ★	★ ★	★ ★
b) Record linkage. **			
c) Self-report. *			
d) No description.			
2) Statistical test:			
a) The statistical test used to analyze the data is clearly described and appropriate, and the measurement of the association is presented, including confidence intervals and the probability level (p value). *	★	★	★
b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete.			
TOTAL	★ 7	★ 5	★ 10

17. Modesti PA, Rebokli G, Cappuccio FP, et al. Panethnic differences in blood pressure in Europe: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PloS one. 2016;11(1):e0147601. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0147601